

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the pending Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18-27, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Weindorf '183 (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0118182).

By this Amendment, claims 18, 20, 23, and 25 have been amended for form, claims 21-22 have been cancelled, and new claims 28-31 have been introduced. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added. As such, claims 18-31, are currently presented for examination, of which claims 18 and 23 are the sole independent claims.

Applicants traverse the §102(e) rejections for the following reasons:

### I. Rejections Under §102(e).

As noted above, independent claim 18 positively recites, *inter alia*, a ***calculating unit*** configured to ***calculate a target display brightness of the display unit*** based on the surrounding lightness detected by the detector . . . and a brightness control unit configured to supply a brightness control signal for changing a current display brightness to the display unit when the current display brightness does not equal the target display brightness. Independent claim 18 also positively recites that, when the ***first mode is selected***, the ***brightness control unit supplies a first brightness control signal changing the current display brightness by a predetermined brightness which is smaller than a difference between the current display brightness and the target brightness***, and when ***the second mode is selected***, the ***brightness control unit supplies a second brightness control signal changing the current display brightness by the difference***.

Applicant submits that these features are amply supported and described by the embodiments disclosed throughout the written description. By way of illustration only, the disclosed embodiments provide the display brightness of the display unit (22) is changed or

controlled when the lightness of surroundings detected by the detector (201) changes. The target display brightness of the display unit (22) changes based on the lightness of surroundings detected. (See, FIG. 4).

The disclosed embodiments further provide that, to change the current display brightness to the target brightness, two modes are employed: (a) the first mode changes the brightness in a stepwise fashion (as in the first embodiment), and the second mode changes the brightness instantaneously. (See, FIG. 10). In a second embodiment, the user can choose a mode based his or her choice. (See, Specification: page 16, lines 17-24 and page 19, lines 12-19; claim 19). According to a third embodiment, a mode is selected based on the difference between the current brightness and the target brightness. (See, Specification: page 19, line 22 to page 20, line 4 and page 22, lines 13-19; claim 20). The threshold for selecting the mode is changeable. (See, Specification: page 22, lines 11-12 and claim 29). Thus, the claimed invention can provide a display device which is easy to be handled by changing the brightness based on the lightness of surroundings and the user's preference.

With this said, Applicant respectfully submits that, despite the Examiner's contentions, the asserted primary reference, Weindorf '183, clearly fails to suggest each and every element of claim 18 including, for example, the features identified above. In particular, there is absolutely nothing in Weindorf '183, that remotely suggests ***calculating a target display brightness***. That is, Weindorf '183 merely teaches the determination of "DAY" and "NIGHT" settings. In so doing, Weindorf '183 specifically teaches that a day/night comparator 340 sends a "DAY" determination to the day/night selector 344 when daytime ambient light conditions exist and when nighttime ambient light condition exists, the day/night comparator 340 sends a "NIGHT" determination to the day/night selector 344. (See, Weindorf '183: par. [0068], lines 20-25).

As such, there is absolutely nothing in Weindorf '183 that remotely suggests a ***calculating unit*** configured to ***calculate a target display brightness of the display unit*** based on the surrounding lightness detected by the detector, as required by claim 18.

Equally notable, Weindorf '183 teaches that the changing unit changes the display brightness of the display in a stepwise fashion. (See, Weindorf '183: par. [0038], lines 1-7; Table 1, step number). And, that the brightness control system may adjust the daytime brightness automatically in response to changes in ambient light. In one aspect, the digitized sensor signal from the logarithmic sensor 114 is compared to the logarithmic amplifier values in Table 1, so that the step number for the digitized sensor signal having a value nearest the logarithmic amplifier value in Table 1 is selected as the step number.

Thus, Weindorf '183 merely teaches a selection between the day mode and the night mode in which the step numbers (Sn) are based on the night and day luminance adjustment sequences and output values from the photodiode and the logarithmic amplifiers. (See also, Weindorf '183: par. [0035]). There is, therefore, absolutely nothing in Weindorf '183 that suggests that, when the first mode is selected, *the brightness control unit supplies a first brightness control signal changing the current display brightness by a predetermined brightness which is smaller than a difference between the current display brightness and the target brightness*, and when the second mode is selected, *the brightness control unit supplies a second brightness control signal changing the current display brightness by the difference*, as also required by claim 18.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 18 is neither anticipated nor rendered unpatentable in view of the primary reference. Accordingly, claim 18 is clearly patentable. And, because claims 19-22 and 28-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 18, claims 19-22 and 28-29 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations.

Moreover, because claim 23 recites similar patentable features as claim 18, claim 23 is patentable for at least similar reasons as those presented relative to claim 18. Also, because claims 24-27 and 30-31, depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 23, claims 24-27 and 30-31 are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the §102 rejections of claims 18-27 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number **03-3975**. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully Submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP  
SHAW PITTMAN, LLP

By: 

E. R. HERNANDEZ  
Reg. No. 47,641  
Tel. No. 703.770.7788  
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: September 22, 2008  
P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-7900